5-25-2005

James B. Crooks

James B. Crooks
University of North Florida

Elinor A. Scheirer
University of North Florida, escheire@unf.edu

C: My name is Jim Crooks, Professor Emeritus from the History Department at UNF. [I] came here in June, 1972, as the second chairperson of History. The first person having been hired, and then his wife persuaded him not to come down for the job. So I fortuitously arrived on the scene in the spring of 1972, was interviewed and was offered the job of Chair and Assistant Dean.

S: And Assistant Dean as well? All at one time, when you were interviewing for a professorship?

C: A position.

S: And you retired in?

C: 2001.

S: 2001, really? I didn't know it was that long ago. Doesn't seem that long ago. Before you came here, where were you and what were you up to then?

C: I taught for six years at Hollins College in Virginia, and prior to that I taught for two years at the University College in Dublin, Ireland, and prior to that in 1964, I graduated with a Ph. D. from Johns Hopkins, in History.

S: Why did you find UNF an attractive option?

C: Because, well, it's a push-pull effect. At Hollins I was frustrated by the administration, and the winter before Christmas, 1971, when they had the national conventions of the historical association, I ran in to some friends from Stetson who said there was a new university opening in Jacksonville, Florida, and if I was interested, send a letter to the dean of the college. I proceeded to do so, and to Willard Ash, and he responded by asking for my resume, which I sent, and he invited me down in February of 1972. Meanwhile, he checked up on me through a colleague of his from when he was in college, and he was on the faculty at Hollins and gave me, I guess, a positive reference. So we came down here in February, and Florida in February is a lot better than Virginia in February when there's snow on the ground. They invited my wife down, too. So the two of us came down together and interviewed, and I was almost the last chair to be hired in Arts and Sciences, and I was offered a job before we went home. We moved down here in June. We were still up in the chamber building over on the Arlington Expressway because the campus didn't open until September, right before classes. We were in the quarter-system back then, and classes began in the end of September. The big challenge was getting the library to open up, which they did. Whereas, at FIU, they didn't have the library ready until half way through the first quarter. Anyway, that's how . . .

S: So the library caused that delay until October?

C: No, I think it was the quarter system that began in late September.

S: The first day has always been recorded as October 2nd.

C: Well, then it may have been October.

S: Yeah, I was just curious. I'm just somebody who's heard the story.

C: The attraction was to be Chair and Assistant Dean, and get paid almost twice as much as I was getting at Hollins, really maybe only fifty-percent more. And in getting in on the ground floor of the new University. I immediately hired Dale Clifford. Dan Schafer had already been hired by Will Ash, and at the time philosophy was with history and Bob Loftin had been hired. There was a guy named Carlton Williams who was our advisor. He was linked with the Fine Arts Department, but basically it was a three-person department, Dale, Dan, and me, for the first year.

S: Any first impressions that you recall about the environment, both physical and colleagues, and what have you?

C: When we arrived on campus, the end of September through the beginning of October, it was rough. Four buildings, looking like something out of, I guess you would call it, totalitarian architecture. We wondered, some of us, whether it was built to protect the faculty from the students, or to keep the students reined in because this faculty, they would protest, they did protest. Initially, the campus was rough, unruly. I mean there were alligators and stuff like that around, I never saw a wild pig, but I saw the alligators. We knew it was a beginning, so it didn't bother people. We all were crammed together into tiny offices in what is now Daniel Hall. Our college was a very small faculty and we got to know each other, probably at the Boathouse drinking beer.

S: Was that already there, too, the Boathouse?

C: I think so, I think so. But we were small enough that we got to, we were all the business and education and arts and sciences, which were the three colleges at the beginning. We were almost always in the same buildings because buildings nine, ten, and eleven weren't even built.

S: Eight wasn't built yet either.

C: No. We were all strangers to each other. Interestingly Will Ash, as Dean, tried to start a number of social gatherings for faculty and faculty spouses in the fall that were moderately successful, I guess. Roy Lassiter, the first Vice President and Provost, had the theory that this was not going to be a typical college campus. We were commuter faculty, all commuter students, we were living in the big city,

and we would identify with the city and not the University. It was, as far as I remember, there was no sense of building a collegial atmosphere at UNF. I don't know what he thought.

S: That was somewhat intentional as you understood it?

C: We were an upper-level institution. All the students, all the fall students coming from the Community College. Everybody was commuting, students and faculty, and that we would make our work lives on campus, but our total lives would be in the community. In one sense, there's a positive side to that if you're trying to involve people, I'm not sure how successful that was, but the innate downside was it really hurt the building of a faculty community, which I still think exists today. We don't have a sense of collegiality here that a lot of institutions have.

S: Would you suspect that that was a deliberate decision in the eyes of the founding fathers, so to speak?

C: I don't know for sure, what was in the minds of the founding fathers. The other part was the students. The students were attractive, they were older. The standing joke was the average age of the students was thirty-nine, the average age of faculty was thirty-eight, something of that order. They were mature. Oh, interesting point, when I was interviewed and hired, the dean said to me, you're going to have students not as well prepared as you are accustomed to, and your challenge is to prepare them well enough for when they graduate that they can compete with graduates from Florida, Florida State, and elsewhere. I always believed that was a really important principle that most of the faculty at the beginning had heard and bought in to. Whether they were well trained by the community college or not, we didn't know for sure, but we had reservations. [If] we had them the first two years, as we learned in the 1980s, we could do a better job. They came to us less well prepared, but because they were more mature, and highly motivated, they worked hard, and produced. Students were pretty impressive, given the fact that they, too, were finding their way. Many, many first generation college students, a substantial number of women who had dropped out of college to get married, or hadn't gone to college to get married and finally had a chance to go, leading to a number of romances on campus. But from the beginning I and most of my colleagues were very impressed with the students and their willingness to learn, and that's the key of an institution.

The faculty, because we were small and all together in this rabbit warren of a building, building one, we got to know each other in the first year. Somebody coming into history now wouldn't know, let's say, Steve Shapiro from anyone, but we got to know Steve Shapiro the first year, and Paul Eggen and people like that. I think that was a real plus. Guys, I think particularly, but the women, too, we did do stuff like play softball in the spring, and get out and drink beer together. There was a fair amount of, I don't want to say carousing, there was some of that, but

there was a social life of the faculty at lunch time, after work, many of the afternoons spent at the Boathouse, you know, in the later afternoon drinking beer and having a few laughs. The other part of the collegiality is the cultural life, and there was no cultural life at the campus. That took years to develop, whether it was visiting speakers or music or theater. There were attempts at improvisational theater. Jane Decker and others in the second, third, fourth year developed their theater group and they worked very hard at it, and put on some nice plays. They got very little support from the administration. Interestingly there was some consultants from FAU that came up here, must have been second year, it was first or second year because we were still in building one, Daniel Hall, saying how can a University gain an identity if they don't have a sports team? I said well, one way is through the arts: music, painting, ceramics, and theater, particularly theater. Well, over time they picked up on the arts and people like Gerson Yessin did terrific with that. But they've never picked up on the theater department. But that's another story.

S: As you look over thirty-something years, are there key decision points that stand out in terms of the institution and how it played out its evolution or growth?

C: I think the most important was going four years [a four year curriculum] in the early [19]80s, having freshman and sophomores. Interestingly, the upper-level concept was one of doing it on the cheap, thinking we could feed the students in for two years, but we learned pedagogically that you really only have them really for a year because the first six months or semester they're getting used to you, and then you have them getting ready to leave all of a sudden. Whereas in a four- year institution you begin to identify your major students in your sophomore year, and you have two-and-a-half, maybe three years to work with them. So pedagogically a four-year university makes much more sense than a two and two. Two and two is a stop-gap when you can't have a four, which is what we had in the beginning. Actually that was the most important single change in the time we were here. There were others like the beginning of the College of Health Sciences and Nursing, the College of Engineering and Computer Science, but that didn't affect me directly. From the student point of view, the development of athletics became very important, but then again that didn't affect me directly. I'm thinking, in my career, becoming a four-year was the most important.

S: You were also, from time to time, not only department chair, but also in other administrative positions.

C: Yes.

S: From that point of view, how did you see things differently?

C: I was hired, as I mentioned earlier, as Chairman and Assistant Dean. I was Chair for eight years, which was about twice too long. I was really burned out at the

end of that. I was Assistant Dean for about four or five years, as long as Will Ash was Dean. When he was eased out, word came down for me to be eased out as well. Jack Humphries was Interim Dean at the time. He called me in his office and said I think you might want to stop being Assistant Dean. I said why? He said well, they're making some changes. The frustrating thing about being Assistant Dean and it's happened over in business as well, is you have no prescribed duties. Associate Dean has certain, clear-cut responsibilities by definition. An assistant in this institution was to fill in when the dean was not there. We had a program in the beginning called the Leonardo da Vinci Venture Study Program, which is the most creative thing that Will Ash had done in the college, providing an upper-level general education for students who might not have a substantial one at a community college. It worked very well for a few years, and then it started having, and this is very normal, problems. Individual faculty would be teaching it, and maybe not upholding the vision of the Venture Program, or they may be goofing off, or they may be busy doing something else, and it lost priority. We never administered, never held anyone accountable. I volunteered as the Assistant Dean and offered to oversee the Venture Program, and if we had problems could have corrected them and added stuff to make it better, but the dean never went through with it. That was a major frustration because I thought, this is something that can really make us distinctive. When the four-year program began, the Venture Program was phased out because we had our own general education program. Although over the years afterwards, in the 1980s, we introduced the foreign studies program.

S: Foreign culture.

C: Foreign culture requirement, because again, we didn't have a full language program either required or otherwise. And we had a strong feeling that students needed to be exposed to foreign culture. Later on still, we instituted a cultural diversity requirement in a general education program, for the same reason. One of the things that I took some pride in was when we set up a program, as I mentioned earlier, there were only three of us, the goal was to teach contemporary history. We were going to let ancient and medieval, be on hold, and [instead], focus on the globe. We wanted to teach Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin American, and the U.S., and let's see, modern Europe. The second two hires for the second year, covered Asia and Latin America, so we had the globe covered. We required all majors to take at least one Third World course so that they'd have the cultural diversity built in to their program, whether they're going to teach high school or go on and do something else. It's interesting, I had the original description of the program I wrote in 1972 for the catalog, is the same one we're using today, and it's still relevant, which is amazing. I mean it's after thirty years.

S: Yes.

C: I sat back there and we were training people for the twenty-first century on a

global basis. How prescient can one be?

S: If you only had residuals coming.

C: Yeah, right, from the catalog. But as Chair you ask for the administration bit. Chairing, in the beginning, was not as complicated as it became under subsequent chairs because of larger numbers, common course numbering, requirements out of Tallahassee, not to mention other in-house requirements from bookkeeping to the accountability requirements. The downside of it was, we had no resources. We had fewer proportional resources than we have now, and ironically the Dean, who had many wise characteristics, had some narrow visions, too. I went off to teach for six weeks in India. Instead of being on a *per diem* kind of thing, I had to take all my vacation time to do that, even though it sort of looked good upon the university. We could never take our full vacations anyway. We had to be in the office from nine to five, there was this mentality.

The administration, not the Dean, but the Vice President for Administrative Services at one point wanted to put in time clocks for the faculty. Fortunately academic types stopped him, but there was a bit of that mentality beginning that this was a bureaucratic institution first, and an educational institution second. That had to be overcome, and it took awhile. The sense in Arts and Sciences particularly, we saw ourselves as a service institution to the Colleges of Education and Business. They were training teachers and business people and whatever. The impression that we had in Arts and Sciences is that we were secondary to the larger purpose of preparing people for the workplace. In a sense that the mentality here that we felt, was that it was a job preparation, not a human enrichment institution. It wasn't until after we went four years, even later, I remember when I was Interim Dean in the early [19]90s, we all of a sudden discovered that we had the largest student credit hour group of students of the five colleges. We began to push for more resources as a result. No college, no faculty thought we had sufficient resources, and they were right. But it wasn't until the [19]90s that we started coming closer to getting what we felt we were justified in having, based on our productivity. You can't measure the quality of the History program or English program as you can measure, say, the number of students who become teachers or employed in business. That sort of cultural or intangible quality of what a university's about, was missing in the beginning.

Seeing as we perceive looking at the overall institution, within our college and our department, there was an extraordinary number of good teachers, many of whom stayed the whole course. Their commitment, that's another thing, that's another change. The commitment to teaching was number one at the beginning. Research was way down there, it was third. Service was number two, and the service could be service on campus, or it could be service in the community. That changed in the [19]80s, and I saw it change with some regret, though I understand from the faculty point of view that if you're being judged by your

peers, scholarships is important. If you want your institution to be judged by its peers, you have to have standards of scholarship, let's say, this program has certain qualifications, that program has certain qualifications. I think that's part of what an institution changes. Whenever an institution changes: a) there are unintended consequences, but there are also both good and bad consequences. One of the downsides of change and growing larger and becoming more professional was that the personal contact was missing, and some of the intangibles of what the institution was like. Again the learning, the inquiry, teaching emphasis that we had in the beginning. Particularly we saw it in the Venture Program. You've seen attempts since then to try to bring them in. The F. I. G. Program is a major effort to create something for students, and the Honors Programs, and that came around, I guess, in the late 1980s and early 1990s. I don't know if I've handled the administrative side.

S: Another dimension that would be as a faculty member watching the parade, if you will, of administrators and thinking at the presidential level, if you noticed shifts in the character of the institution across the various presidents. We had [President] Carpenter for quite some time, and then there were other administrations with shorter lengths of time. If you wanted to comment on any of that.

C: I think the beginning administrators, Carpenter and Lassiter, were very capable people whose main goals were to get the institution up and running and functioning well. I didn't feel like either one had an intellectual vision for the institution, whether it's in terms of what it might become other than preparing Jacksonville students for employment.

S: In Jacksonville.

C: In Jacksonville. Of course Lassiter came in with a military background, and was a devout Baptist. So all the social events had Hawaiian Punch served. Then they both went up to Tennessee to different institutions. I think Carpenter left first. Ironically, about the time he left, he was talking with one of our colleagues, he said something about how he wished there were more Shakespeare taught at UNF. Our reaction was why the heck hasn't he said this earlier, and shared with us his desire for more of what we would call traditional Liberal Arts. Because we always felt, he came out of the Business Administration background and Lassiter was an economist in the Business College at Gainesville. We had an interim who was Andy Robinson, that's when I got in trouble. I was chair of the search committee that didn't recommend Andrew, and we got sued by the NAACP in the process. We had a year long search, very complicated, we recommended three people. Curt McCray was actually appointed, though he wasn't my top choice, that's something else. We had a secret ballot, and then we had to have a public ballot to make sure that we weren't being racist in not selecting Andrew Robinson. Some of us have thought about it since then, whether we made a

mistake or not including him in the top three, because as we were told if he was in the top three, he would get the job. Our concern was, well we really want to make sure who the top three are. Twelve out of eighteen committee members thought that he did not belong in the top three. It wasn't the fifty-one to forty-nine percent, two-thirds, one-third. It was virtually a consensus. McCray was funny. Having interviewed him and chaired that system, I had very little to do with him once he became president. I'd stopped being chairman by that time. John Minahan, when he was Vice President, I guess Lassiter left first. Minahan came in and let it be known to the Interim Arts and Science Dean that he didn't want me as chair anymore. Never told me why. He could have said, well haven't you been chair long enough, that type of thing, and graciously said something, but no. All I was told was that you're no longer chair of this department. I thought that was a peculiar way of handling it, but then the next year I was asked to be, somebody in your college, in Education, was not going on the search committee, and they, for some good reason, backed off, and I got stuck on it at faculty association meeting. I don't know if Bette Soldwedel didn't want it or somebody, and then I wound up being chairman of the darn thing, and that was exhausting. We would end up with McCray. I didn't really even have much to do with McCray, so I can't really comment on him particularly. I had a lot more to do with Adam Herbert, because I was Interim Dean when he was president. Then McCray had his idiosyncracies which others can speak to better than I can. I think the problem, and my perception of the administration was not in the President's office, it was in the provost office. We had so many provosts from Lassiter, who was a strong, competent person I can say, with like I say a somewhat narrow vision, to Minahan, to Merwin, to the sociologist . . .

S: Bardo?

C: Bardo. Ken Martin, and then briefly Adam Ling. We had more provosts in the first twenty years than any stable institution should have. Eight or nine different provosts, and all of them other than Lassiter were pretty unpopular. Ken Martin was eased out. Bardo must have seen the handwriting on the wall because he went elsewhere. Merwin wheeled and dealed like a political boss, but then was moving up and moved out, too. Ling had great potential, but again he didn't live very long. I attribute this, I owe it to a comparison type thing. FIU and UNF started the same fall. We were in much better shape the first year in terms of starting a new university, getting it going smoothly and providing education to our students. They were a mess down there. I don't know why, but I mentioned the library and classes were erratic. I met our history counterparts down there, and they didn't seem to be doing as substantial a job as our limited three of us were doing here or five of us in the second year.

But within ten years, they were moving way ahead of us, whether it's in terms of doctoral programs and campuses, in terms of faculty doing scholarship. They had some leadership there that we didn't have. We had the same problem

in the College of Arts and Sciences after Will Ash left. We had a series of deans, most of whom we were just as happy to get rid of as we were to hire them. I think that was important. I'm convinced that hiring people for administrative jobs is one of the most difficult things to do on short notice. Even when Will Ash hired his first seven chairs, maybe three or four at the most were competent. He was a competent person for hiring, but the sociology chair disappeared after one year. Then we had Gary Harmon and Tom Mongar, who were both hired by Will and their departments had major complaints about them. He wound up with, that's three out of the seven right there. It's almost a crapshoot, and we've had that with provosts, and we've had it with deans. It's a little bit better with department chairs, I don't know how it is in your college. The department chairs became elected essentially, chosen. I mean our department, we had one chair that we did not want to have a second four-year term. Others voluntarily left after four years, but all were altogether endorsed by their colleagues in the department.

S: How did, I mean I may be diverting from our agenda, but how did that happen? I can't imagine it happening in education, to have that much of a role for the faculty to determine who is chair. So how did you create an environment where that could happen?

C: That's interesting. I'm not sure.

S: A little self-interest here. We won't put this on the web.

C: I'm not sure how we did that. I think, for one thing, that the Department of History and Philosophy has had an unusually compatible relationship over the years, until philosophy formed its own department. We had one person who was fired, and sued us, but other than that one person, the departments worked extraordinarily well together, with basic respect for one another.

Now as far as why we got to choose. There was a point in time, well, first off, elsewhere [in the SUS] that the chairs were members of collective bargaining, but at UNF the chairs would never be a part of collective bargaining. That was a provision Tom Carpenter laid down when the union first formed back in the 1970s. Immediately the chair became part of management, and that gave the dean the right to appoint chairs. It wasn't under the first dean, but it must have been under the second or third dean that we began to select, or the dean began to ask for advice, and the dean appointed the chair, but it came with the recommendation of the faculty of our college. There was a point, too, I remember when myself and Jane Decker and a couple others wrote bylaws for the college to control one of the deans. Peter Salus had a tendency to go follow his own ego in whatever direction it took him. And we had a college faculty that gave us some support when we disagreed with the dean. I think the whole college faculty had a resolution of no-confidence, and the top of the administration would have to listen to them. Did your college have a functioning faculty organization?

S: We came on that after you in Arts and Sciences put that together, and ours dates from the late 1980s only. Yours was much earlier. We actually came to that, knowing you had paved the way for us with your organization.

C: Arts and Sciences had the reputation for being more “radical,” [in quotes]. We had people like Tom Mongar, Jane Decker, and Dale Clifford in her own way, Allen Tilley, and Bill Slaughter, and a few others who fostered this strong sense of faculty representation. They were the key people who formed the union. Steve DeLue was one of the people involved. The early leadership in the union was outstanding, and it helped resolve discrimination on the part of the administration. There might be chairs who wouldn't hire faculty for the summer time out of pique or discrimination, and the union supported them. The union supported statewide sabbaticals, which had not existed in Florida state schools. In the early years, there's been a lot of really good things, and the Arts and Sciences faculty has been involved in that.

S: That sort of leads into something that we don't have as a stand alone piece here, but the issue of governance, and faculty involvement with governance. Can you say anything more about that?

C: Well, [in] the beginning the faculty association concept was pretty unique to pre-UNF, and it was Roy Lassiter's creation to say that we were a small enough faculty that we could all come together through a process to settle standards, and our criteria and our curriculum and so forth. Of course, as you know, that's faded over the years, and only a handful of faculty attend and perhaps it’s time now to have a faculty senate like the other larger universities do. But in the beginning years, it served not only the function of government in the area of curriculum and programs, but it also helped promote what little collegiality there was on campus. I would guess that disappeared in the mid-1980s, early 1990s, in terms of functioning well as an institution. Steve Shapiro and others need to talk to that more than I can.

S: One of the notions that's indicated here, and in a sense you've spoken to it, but I'll highlight it, is the notion of developments with which you can associate some sense of pride. You've alluded to, things that you were proud to be associated with or whatever that the institution's done or the department's done. Do you want to reiterate or expand on any of that?

C: Oh yes, I'd add a couple of things. I mentioned, in terms of the History department, which I feel very positive about its character over thirty years. We had a disproportionate number of distinguished professor awards and teaching awards and stuff like that, which is an indication of that [success]. Almost every department usually has one weak faculty person. You know this is law of averages, and we've been pretty much able to avoid that. We can't quite say that right now with somebody in jail, but that's another issue.

S: We won't go there. Still in jail?

C: I don't know, I haven't talked to anybody. The other thing in terms of curriculum, I've always been interested in curriculum. In fact, I'm published in the area of general education a couple times. I was on the committee, chaired I think by Charles Winton. Periodically, we have a broad university-wide curriculum committee, and we've had a couple focusing on [general education] after we became a four-year [university], and I was largely responsible for getting the diversity requirements in place, and persuading the committee and then the Faculty Association to have that for undergraduates coming in here, particularly from the Duval County Schools which might not have much diversity there. The one disappointment in terms of curriculum I thought, was in the lack of interdisciplinary orientation, and I felt that we should have programs like urban studies and American studies and stuff like that, and we're not able to do that, partly because we had unsympathetic deans, and partly because of the bureaucratic structure of assigning teaching loads. How do you team teach a course and award student credit hours for faculty, and how do you maintain your productivity? All those kind of bureaucratic terms that frustrate, particularly a small, underfunded university. Private schools don't worry about that. At Hollins we didn't worry about that at all. Large universities like Florida and Florida State have built in over the years pockets of money [so] that they can do things like that. It's only been in the last ten years, or actually since the beginning of the honors program, that we've been able to have the kind of resources that encourage that, encourages subsidizing European travel for students and things like that. We did not have that at all in the beginning. That was frustrating. You wind up doing your traditional kind of stuff without the opportunity of cross-disciplinary teaching. We have some now but didn't back then. Curriculum was always important to me. When we had to squeeze back, I guess this may have been in the 1990s. The state cut back the general education requirement, and we had to squeeze it back, I was involved in trying to figure out how we could do that, and yet maintain the breadth that we had for the students who could take philosophy and students who could take art.

S: Was that the 120 hour rule? When we had to reduce everything to 120 hours?

C: Yes. General education, I don't remember what it was. Again, underlying our efforts, particularly in general education after we were a four-year [institution], was this awareness that we come from a culturally conservative, for lack of a better term, area of the country, that when students come to UNF, without the background that say, either wealthier students or more sophisticated parts of the country offer. So again, we're trying to play catch-up. That's why it's so important to have a strong humanities orientation within general education, as well as the science and the math and social sciences. I feel like I was able to play a role in that, which I found rewarding.

S: Do you want to think of it from the flip side of mistakes? Not so much mistakes you made, but mistakes you think your institution made. We've alluded to that as well, but maybe others. . .

C: Well, you know, it's interesting, I said hiring administrators is a crapshoot sometimes. It's hard to pick people I think, and chairing the presidential search committee in 1981 that recommended three people, one of whom was McCray. He wasn't our first choice. Another one of those who later became president at FAU and did a very good job down there. The third one, who was a top choice for many of us, I have no idea what happened to him, but he was a provost at University of Colorado, Boulder, but he didn't apparently pass mustard with the Board of Regents Committee.

[End of Tape A, Side 1.]

C: I think we made a mistake in not developing theater. You can do it very expensively or do it not very expensively, but no one [did so], and we've had individual faculty over time. Some have been successful, some of them not successfully attempting to do theater, but I think we missed the boat on that. I think, well, it's hard to think, I'm having trouble remembering mistakes. I think the early mistake of not having a better sense of what a university might be. It's not a trade school, but it's much broader than that, and it took us a long while to overcome that mentality. I think that we did not do a good job of creating a faculty culture here, or a student culture. I've been very disappointed, and I can't speak for recently, but very disappointed in the way that the university developed student extracurricular activities. I don't know whether it was the people in charge without imagination or the lack of resources, but I come out of a personal tradition that says the extracurriculum is as important as the curriculum. It's partly a socialization process, it's partly a networking process, it's partly learning new skills that you don't get in the classroom. I think we deprived our students over the years of opportunities that they should have had, in terms of the extra-curriculum. I have no idea what's happening now, so I can't judge.

Now we have enough people living on campus that we should have a really good opportunity. When we finally did start having cultural events on campus, it was very tough getting students to go to them, unless you required that their class go to them. I remember in the early 1970's, Ann Radwan, our Asian historian had started this Ambassador Speakers series, and got a Florida Humanities grant. This was a very cheap speaker's program to run because all you had to do was put them up and pay their transportation, there was no fee. I think it went for two years, maybe three. We had the Ambassador from the Court of St. James [Great Britain], South Africa, Chile, and really places from all over the world, bringing them to Jacksonville, Florida, and the university wouldn't support it. Ann Radwan gave up in disgust, and rightly so. The whole time that she was doing it, she had to struggle to get resources and to get public relations

to do a decent job of publicizing. I don't doubt that that area of the university didn't really function well. I know it's tough to get PR in this community, because I've been involved in it outside. At the same time, the university, whether it wasn't focusing on the right things, it seemed to have a very hard time creating an image for itself. I think the administration's fell down in that area as well. Academically, well, we didn't have the resources to do things like the physics major, which we should have done, but we didn't have the resources to do archeology. We had one guy here on a soft line for five years, before you get on a tenured line.

S: That was a major celebration point when that finally happened.

C: Yes. Everybody connected with the institution will agree, I think, back then that we were underfunded from the beginning, that the state was stingy with us. I don't know whether it was a case of Gainesville got more than it should have or whether the state, the Board of Regents, failed to understand that we needed to have more start-up money for maybe not just one year, but five or ten years to get an institution going. I think there were mistakes made in under-funding UNF that hurt the caliber of the overall performance of the institution. When Dan Schafer was writing his ten year history, the different departments and colleges were invited to write their ten year history, and I wrote the one for the History Department, I had just finished being the chair. I had some extra time off. I wrote a very damning essay on how over the first ten years the faculty support dollars had fallen. I think maybe the amount of support money for travel and stuff like that had stayed level, but we added new faculty and without any money. That was indicative of how it saw support of higher education, sort of a worm's eye view of it.

S: Shifting just a little bit, and you've alluded again to this, but maybe a highlight is worth it: two or three colorful characters that stand out.

C: Bob Loftin. When I first met Bob, he'd been hired already by Will Ash, to Will's credit. Bob had been fired at Stetson University, even though he had just been awarded outstanding teacher award, for being unwilling to tow the line of administration policy there. So, Will hired him. When I first met him he was wearing red, white, and blue sneakers and shorts, and he always had a cap on. This in the days before everybody wore caps, baseball caps. [He] had a beard and had this south Georgia drawl, almost hiding a brilliant mind. He was a character in the way he talked, talking like a redneck or poor white person, but at the same time he taught brilliantly. Also, he didn't teach traditionally. He eventually met some problems fleshing out the Philosophy program because his idiosyncratic approach didn't fit with anybody, but he was very, very popular. He started Sawmill Slough, the environmental conservation program on campus. He got the nature trails [operational] and spent an inordinate amount of time in support of preserving the campus's natural habitat. We received national

recognition from the federal government for the nature preserve through his effort. He was certainly the most unpredictable character that I saw on a daily basis. Always sort of agreeable. The only time he really had trouble was when he had to make the choice when we were hiring somebody, and he didn't make decisions very well. But that was a minor glitch. It's just that his kind just didn't look like he fit on campus--more likely driving a truck, the wheel of a pick-up truck, or a power mower out doing somebody's lawn, but again, you have this first-rate teacher who received all kind of teacher awards, and was highly, highly respected by the staff. I'm not good at remembering stories, but I'm sure there are a bundle of them that people could remember that have better memories than mine.

S: The last in the formal purpose questions would be any comments that you want to make about this process, or things you might have overlooked, or things you want to say [now] that you have a chance to say?

C: I was thinking a little about this before coming out here this week. It almost seems like we need to encourage people being interviewed to prepare themselves a little bit about what we'd like to cover in the invitational letter that goes out. Some major decisions or policies that they've been involved in, the colorful characters or the mistakes that they've seen, achievement they've seen. To do it cold, I can't even do it lukewarm.

S: You're probably more than lukewarm, because you've been involved in this process.

C: A little bit, but I haven't spent a lot of time thinking about it either, and I haven't gone back to, say, look at the records, like I was supposed to. I think too, and I've done my own oral interviews with others before, but for people who haven't done this very much, to reflect back on thirty years is going to be a challenge. I guess I can remember more stuff from the [19]70s than I can from the [19]90s, which also says something about is this going to be a problem in other interviews. The one thing I hadn't talked about was the honors program. I taught in that for five years, and I did my best teaching in that. I taught a course on American Poverty, in which students would go out [in the community]. [On] campus was a seminar, but they did service learning in the inner-city. There was both satisfaction and disappointments with that, but overall it brought together, what I've always felt to be the heart and soul of education, both affective and cognitive learning. I think the honors program, from the perspective I had, was an excellent opportunity for students that draws students from all over the state of Florida. Normally you don't think of kids from Miami, Dade, or Fort Myers, or Ocala coming here to school, but through recruitment and through the program we offer, which is very much affective as well as cognitive, we've lots of different kinds of opportunities. The honors program has given UNF some real distinction.

This comes back to another issue, which was your last question, is how does a university create its own distinctive character? Obviously Yale and Harvard have been around for a few years. It's interesting in my impression that the University of Florida has, only in the last twenty years, begun to approach becoming a great university, partly because Florida so discredited higher education. When I was in grad school in the 1960s, unless you were a southerner you didn't want to go South. That was the land of segregation and the Bible Belt and lack of support for higher education, but that's changed. At your bell-weather institutions like the University of Georgia and so forth, University of Florida in the last twenty-five years. Then you have all those institutions between either the small, elite private schools like Davidson College and Spelman College in Atlanta and Amherst College, and your old Ivy-type schools or Vanderbilt, and your major state universities like Florida and Michigan and Ohio. Where do schools like UNF fit in? Where does Central Florida fit in? Where does FAU fit in? I don't know if we have an answer to that. One of the research projects I did back in the 1980s and 1990s was to look at urban universities across the country. Places like the University of Cincinnati, City College of New York, Boston University, Temple University in Philadelphia, Wayne State in Detroit. They made commitments to their communities, to their cities. They made commitments to their cities to serve them creatively, not simply in terms of training accountants and public administrators, but also in terms of doing research for them or training their employees, creating institutes that serve the metropolitan area. There used to be an association of urban universities that came together with that kind of focus. That kind of ended in the 1970s partly because so many southern universities were in the suburbs, like ours, and partly because there were other things [that] came on the scene and there was some belt-tightening as well.

The honors program is a way of doing it, our jazz program is a way of doing it, theater might have been a way of doing it. One of the regrets I had was that the College of Education never developed the connection with the Florida School for Deaf and Blind that it might have in the early years. If it had done that, this could have been a national center for education of deaf and blind, you know a partnership with the two schools. It's there now, but I think we missed something back then. I think that it's something we're still working on as an institution. Central Florida's trying to do it now by football, which I think is absurd. Well, maybe not absurd, but I'm amused at their attempt to do it. Honestly in the popular mind, sports is the way to go for an institution, but there must be another way and there are other ways. We won't have a law school or a medical school, but I find it interesting that our pre-law students in a national competition always rank very, very high. Our computer students at a national competition always seem to rank very, very high. So the national talent is here. We've only begun to tap their development. Adam Herbert at one point, partly tongue and cheek, talked about Harvard on the St. John's, but if you could be the Williamsburg, or William and Mary.

S: William and Mary.

C: College of William and Mary in Florida.

S: Or even Miami of Ohio.

C: Miami of Ohio in the state of Florida, but we're not going to do that, that's not going to happen. We have New College down in Sarasota that is the alternative educational institution. Adam Herbert had a good idea, he was even looking, thinking in those terms, and that would make sense to be able to say that, but you can't, I don't think. We can't show ourselves to be more distinctive than West Florida and FAU. We're not going to compete in terms of scholarship with FAU or even FIU, but we could compete in terms of people which is at the root of what we began with. So maybe that's something else we could explore more. I think I've spoken enough.

S: I don't know if I agree with that, but I'll take your cue.

[End of Interview.]